



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/921,192	08/02/2001	David C. Turner	VTN-548	6090

7590

06/12/2006

PHILIP S. JOHNSON  
ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA  
NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003

EXAMINER
----------

WOLLSCHLAGER, JEFFREY MICHAEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1732

DATE MAILED: 06/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/921,192

Applicant(s)

TURNER ET AL.

Examiner

Jeff Wollschlager

Art Unit

1732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-21, 23-32 and 34-87 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12, 13, 27-30, 42-51 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-11, 14-21, 23-26, 31, 32, 34-41 and 52-87 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 17, 2006 has been entered.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

The indicated allowability of claims 4,11,17,19,20,22,26,33-35,37, and 41 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s). Rejections based on the newly discovered reference(s) follow.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 21 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

In the context of the amendment to claim 14, it appears applicant's intent was to cancel this claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 75 and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 75 recites the limitation "wherein the low boiling point solvent and the high boiling point solvent are present at a ratio of about 1:1". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 14-21, 31, 32, 34-37, 52-54, 64-66, and 76-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gartley et al. (U.S. Patent 6,248,266; issued June 19, 2001).

Regarding claims 1-3 and 6 Gartley et al. teach a method for manufacturing a contact lens comprising the steps: a) coating a molding surface of a mold with a coating of a high molecular weight coating composition, specifically a colored material in one

embodiment, (col. 2, lines 30-36; col. 4, lines 1-11); b) dispensing a monomer mixture comprising a silicone containing hydrogel monomer into the mold (col. 3, lines 30-32); and c) curing the monomer mixture and the coating composition (col. 1, lines 43-52). Further, Gartley et al. teach the curing may be performed by various conventional methods for a sufficient time (col. 2, lines 44-57). Gartley et al. do not explicitly teach the dwell time is less than about 5 minutes or less than about 45 seconds.

However, cure time, as taught by Gartley et al., is a function of a variety of variables that impact the rate of polymerization such as the amount of heat and light applied. Further, the cure time is impacted by the potential utilization of catalysts, the specific composition of the coating and the monomer mixture and the amount of diluent employed. Even more, dwell time has a direct impact on the productivity and costs of the operation. As such, one having ordinary skill would be motivated to reduce the time the curing mixture dwelled in the mold to as short a time as possible and would remove the lens from the mold as soon as the lens was adequately cured. Therefore, cure time/dwell time are result effective variables that would have been readily optimized as is routinely practiced in the art.

It is noted that the term "high molecular weight coating" is open to broad interpretation. The pigments employed by Gartley et al. meet the limitations of the claim.

As to claims 5 and 7, Gartley et al. teach method for manufacturing a contact lens comprising the steps: a) coating a molding surface of a mold with an implicitly high molecular weight material greater than 300 kD (col. 3, lines 17-30); b) dispensing a

Art Unit: 1732

monomer mixture comprising a silicone containing hydrogel monomer into the mold (col. 3, lines 30-32); and c) curing the monomer mixture and the coating composition (col. 1, lines 43-52). Further, Gartley et al. teach the curing may be performed by various conventional methods for a sufficient time (col. 2, lines 44-57). Gartley et al. do not explicitly teach the dwell time is less than about 45 seconds.

However, cure time, as taught by Gartley et al., is a function of a variety of variables that impact the rate of polymerization such as the amount of heat and light applied. Further, the cure time is impacted by the potential utilization of catalysts, the specific composition of the coating and the monomer mixture and the amount of diluent employed. Even more, dwell time has a direct impact on the productivity and costs of the operation. As such, one having ordinary skill would be motivated to reduce the time the curing mixture dwelled in the mold to as short a time as possible and would remove the lens from the mold as soon as the lens was adequately cured. Therefore, cure time/dwell time are result effective variables that would have been readily optimized as is routinely practiced in the art.

Gartley et al. teach applying 2-hydroxyethylmethacrylate with a crosslinking monomer (col. 3, lines 26-30). This cross-linking monomer will react to implicitly form a polymer with a molecular weight greater than 300 kD. It is noted that this is the same preferred coating material taught in the instant specification. Gartley et al. goes on to teach that a silicone containing monomer may be added to this mixture to form a silicone hydrogel after curing (col. 3, lines 30-32).

Regarding claims 14-18 and 21, Gartley et al. teach a method for manufacturing a contact lens comprising the steps: a) coating a molding surface of a mold with a high molecular weight material comprising poly(2-hydroxyethylmethacrylate) (col. 3, lines 17-30); b) dispensing a monomer mixture comprising a silicone containing hydrogel monomer into the mold (col. 3, lines 30-32); and c) curing the monomer mixture and the coating composition (col. 1, lines 43-52). Further, Gartley et al. teach the curing may be performed by various conventional methods for a sufficient time (col. 2, lines 44-57). Gartley et al. does not explicitly teach the cure time/dwell time is less than about 5 minutes or 45 seconds.

However, cure time, as taught by Gartley et al., is a function of a variety of variables that impact the rate of polymerization such as the amount of heat and light applied. Further, the cure time is impacted by the potential utilization of catalysts, the specific composition of the coating and the monomer mixture and the amount of diluent employed. Even more, cure time has a direct impact on the productivity and operating costs of the operation. As such, cure time is a result effective variable that would have been readily optimized as is routinely practiced in the art.

Gartley et al. teach applying 2-hydroxyethylmethacrylate with a crosslinking monomer (col. 3, lines 26-30). This cross-linking monomer will cause the 2-hydroxyethylmethacrylate to polymerize. It is noted that this is the same preferred coating material taught in the instant specification. Gartley et al. goes on to teach that a silicone containing monomer may be added to this mixture to form a silicone hydrogel after curing (col. 3, lines 30-32).

As to claims 19 and 20, Gartley et al. teach various overlapping compositions of the claimed silicone hydrogel monomer mixture (col. 3, lines 30-48) that are well-known in the lens-forming art.

Regarding claims 31, 32, 36, and 37, Gartley et al. teach a method for manufacturing a contact lens comprising the steps: a) coating a molding surface of a mold with an implicitly high molecular weight material greater than 300 kD (col. 3, lines 17-30); b) dispensing a monomer mixture comprising a silicone containing hydrogel monomer into the mold (col. 3, lines 30-32); and c) curing the monomer mixture and the coating composition (col. 1, lines 43-52). Further, Gartley et al. teach the curing may be performed by various conventional methods for a sufficient time (col. 2, lines 44-57). Gartley et al. does not explicitly teach the cure time/dwell time is less than about 45 seconds.

However, cure time, as taught by Gartley et al., is a function of a variety of variables that impact the rate of polymerization such as the amount of heat and light applied. Further, the cure time is impacted by the potential utilization of catalysts, the specific composition of the coating and the monomer mixture and the amount of diluent employed. Even more, cure time has a direct impact on the productivity and operating costs of the operation. As such, cure time is a result effective variable that would have been readily optimized as is routinely practiced in the art.

Gartley et al. teach applying 2-hydroxyethylmethacrylate with a crosslinking monomer (col. 3, lines 26-30). This cross-linking monomer will react to implicitly form a polymer with a molecular weight greater than 300 kD. It is noted that this is the same



preferred coating material taught in the instant specification. Gartley et al. goes on to teach that a silicone containing monomer may be added to this mixture to form a silicone hydrogel after curing (col. 3, lines 30-32).

As to claims 34 and 35, Gartley et al. teach various overlapping compositions of the claimed silicone hydrogel monomer mixture (col. 3, lines 30-48) that are well-known in the lens-forming art.

As to claims 52-54, 64-66, and 76-78 Gartley et al. teach the method of claims 1, 14, and 31 as discussed in the 103(a) rejections above, but do not specify the viscosity of the coating compositions. However, Gartley et al. teach one of the same preferred coating compositions as the instant specification (e.g. 2-hydroxyethylmethacrylate) and also teach that the pigment coating composition may have an inert liquid diluent mixed with it (col. 3, lines 59-62). As such, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill to control the viscosity within the claimed ranges to ensure the ability of the coating to readily flow and coat the mold.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 14-21, 23-26, 31, 32, 34-41, and 52-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muir et al. (WO 00/04078; published January 27, 2000).

For applicant's convenience, due to the length of the Muir et al. reference, the citations from Muir et al. employed in this rejection are pulled from U.S. Patent 6,893,595 to Muir et al. which is substantially the same as the WIPO document.

Regarding claims 1-3 and 6 Muir et al. teach a method for manufacturing coated polymeric articles, including contact lens, comprising the steps: a) coating a molding surface of a mold with a coating of a high molecular weight coating composition, specifically a coating polymer denoted as Polymer A, (Abstract; col. 2, lines 7-12); b) dispensing a monomer mixture comprising a silicone containing hydrogel monomer into the mold (Abstract; col. 2, lines 13-17); and c) curing the monomer mixture, denoted as Polymer B, and the coating composition (Abstract; col. 2, lines 18-24). Further, Muir et al. teach the curing may be performed by various conventional methods such as with the use of a catalyst (col. 10, lines 1-10) and UV and actinic radiation (col. 11, lines 30-55). Muir et al. further teach that the cure time is optimized with initiators and chain transfer agents (col. 15, lines 11-18). Muir et al. do not explicitly teach the dwell time is less than about 5 minutes or less than about 45 seconds.

However, cure time, as taught by Muir et al., is a function of a variety of variables that impact the rate of polymerization such as the amount and type of catalyst, radiation, initiators and chain transfer agents. Further, the cure time is impacted by the specific composition of the coating and the monomer mixture and the amount of diluent employed. Even more, cure time has a direct impact on the productivity and costs of the operation. As such, one having ordinary skill would be motivated to reduce the time the curing mixture dwelled in the mold to as short a time as possible and would remove the lens from the mold as soon as the lens was adequately cured. Therefore, cure time/dwell time are result effective variables that would have been readily optimized as is routinely practiced in the art.

As to claims 5 and 7, Muir et al. do not specify the molecular weight of the coating composition, Polymer A. However, Muir et al. teach the use of the same cross-linked polymers as applicant. As such, the molecular weight of the coating compositions taught by Muir et al. will overlap the claimed molecular weight.

As to claim 8, Muir et al. teach the coating composition comprises, for example, an aqueous (high boiling) and organic (low boiling) solvent (col. 13, lines 48-52). Muir et al. further teach various other solvents for the coating composition (col. 8, line 59 – col. 9, line 55).

As to claim 9, Muir et al. do not explicitly teach that the coating of the mold is carried out by spin coating. However, the examiner takes official notice that that spin coating is an old and notoriously well-known method for making a lens, for example, that does not provide a contribution over the prior art.

As to claim 10, Muir et al. exemplify using coating compositions that are applied to the surface of the mold via dip molding followed by application of 40 micro liters of monomer. (col. 25, lines 1-18). Clearly the amount of coating is an order of magnitude less than the amount of the bulk material. As such, Muir et al. teach an obvious overlapping range.

As to claim 11, using pressurized air for cleaning surfaces is well-known and would have been obviously employed, as needed, by one having ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding claims 14-18 and 21 Muir et al. teach a method for manufacturing coated polymeric articles, including contact lens, comprising the steps: a) coating a molding surface of a mold with a coating of a high molecular weight coating

Art Unit: 1732

composition, specifically a coating polymer denoted as Polymer A, comprising poly (2-hydroxyethylmethacrylate) (col. 31, line 40-45); b) dispensing a monomer mixture comprising a hydrogel monomer, silicone containing hydrogel monomer or combination thereof into the mold (Abstract; col. 2, lines 13-17); and c) curing the monomer mixture, denoted as Polymer B, and the coating composition (Abstract; col. 2, lines 18-24).

Further, Muir et al. teach the curing may be performed by various conventional methods such as with the use of catalyst (col. 10, lines 1-10) and UV and actinic radiation (col. 11, lines 30-55). Muir et al. further teach that the cure time is optimized with initiators and chain transfer agents (col. 15, lines 11-18). Muir et al. do not explicitly teach the dwell time is less than about 5 minutes or less than about 45 seconds.

However, cure time, as taught by Muir et al., is a function of a variety of variables that impact the rate of polymerization such as the amount and type of catalyst, radiation, initiators and chain transfer agents. Further, the cure time is impacted by the specific composition of the coating and the monomer mixture and the amount of diluent employed. Even more, cure time has a direct impact on the productivity and costs of the operation. As such, one having ordinary skill would be motivated to reduce the time the curing mixture dwelled in the mold to as short a time as possible and would remove the lens from the mold as soon as the lens was adequately cured. Therefore, cure time/dwell time are result effective variables that would have been readily optimized as is routinely practiced in the art.

As to claims 19 and 20, Muir et al. provide examples of compositions of the claimed silicone hydrogel monomer mixture throughout the disclosure (col. 21, lines 16-20, for example). Further, these compositions are well-known in the lens-forming art.

As to claim 23, Muir et al. teach the coating composition comprises, for example, an aqueous (high boiling) and organic (low boiling) solvent (col. 13, lines 48-52). Muir et al. further teach various other solvents for the coating composition (col. 8, line 59 – col. 9, line 55).

As to claim 24, Muir et al. do not explicitly teach that the coating of the mold is carried out by spin coating. However, the examiner takes official notice that that spin coating is an old and notoriously well-known method for making a contact lens, for example, that does not provide a contribution over the prior art.

As to claim 25, Muir et al. exemplify using coating compositions that are applied to the surface of the mold via dip molding followed by application of 40 micro liters of monomer (col. 25, lines 1-18). Clearly the amount of coating is an order of magnitude less than the amount of the bulk material. As such, Muir et al. teach an obvious overlapping range.

As to claim 26, using pressurized air for cleaning surfaces is well-known and would have been obviously employed, as needed, by one having ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding claims 31, 32, 36, and 37, Muir et al. teach a method for manufacturing a contact lens comprising the steps: a) coating a molding surface of a mold with an implicitly high molecular weight material greater than 300 kD (col. 3, lines 17-30); b) dispensing a monomer mixture comprising a silicone containing hydrogel

monomer into the mold (col. 3, lines 30-32); and c) curing the monomer mixture and the coating composition (Abstract; col. 2, lines 18-24). Further, Muir et al. teach the curing may be performed by various conventional methods such as with the use of catalyst (col. 10, lines 1-10) and UV and actinic radiation (col. 11, lines 30-55). Muir et al. further teach that the cure time is optimized with initiators and chain transfer agents (col. 15, lines 11-18). Muir et al. do not explicitly teach the dwell time is less than about 5 minutes or less than about 45 seconds.

However, cure time, as taught by Muir et al., is a function of a variety of variables that impact the rate of polymerization such as the amount and type of catalyst, radiation, initiators and chain transfer agents. Further, the cure time is impacted by the specific composition of the coating and the monomer mixture and the amount of diluent employed. Even more, cure time has a direct impact on the productivity and costs of the operation. As such, one having ordinary skill would be motivated to reduce the time the curing mixture dwelled in the mold to as short a time as possible and would remove the lens from the mold as soon as the lens was adequately cured. Therefore, cure time/dwell time are result effective variables that would have been readily optimized as is routinely practiced in the art.

Muir et al. do not specify the particular molecular weight of the coating composition. However, Muir et al. do teach the same materials for coating as the instant application and curing the coating composition. As such, the polymer denoted as polymer A would implicitly have a molecular weight greater than 300 kD.

As to claims 34 and 35, Muir et al. provide examples of compositions of the claimed silicone hydrogel monomer mixture throughout the disclosure (col. 21, lines 16-20, for example). Further, these compositions are well-known in the lens-forming art.

As to claim 38, Muir et al. teach the coating composition comprises, for example, an aqueous (high boiling) and organic (low boiling) solvent (col. 13, lines 48-52). Muir et al. further teach various other solvents for the coating composition (col. 8, line 59 – col. 9, line 55).

As to claim 39, Muir et al. does not explicitly teach that the coating of the mold is carried out by spin coating. However, the examiner takes official notice that that spin coating is an old and notoriously well-known method for making a lens, for example, that does not provide a contribution over the prior art.

As to claim 40, Muir et al. exemplify using coating compositions that are applied to the surface of the mold via dip molding followed by application of 40 micro liters of monomer (col. 25, lines 1-18). Clearly the amount of coating is an order of magnitude less than the amount of the bulk material. As such, Muir et al. teach an obvious overlapping range.

As to claim 41, using pressurized air for cleaning surfaces is well-known and would have been obviously employed, as needed, by one having ordinary skill in the art.

As to claims 52-54, 64-66, and 76-78 Muir et al. teach the method of claims 1, 14, and 31 as discussed in the 103(a) rejections above, but do not specify the viscosity of the coating compositions. However, Muir et al. teach adding a diluent for the purpose of controlling its ability to coat the surface of the mold (col. 9, lines 21-23). As such, it

Art Unit: 1732

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill to control the amount of diluent within the claimed viscosity ranges to ensure the coating was readily able to coat the mold.

As to claims 55-63, 67-75, and 80-87 Muir et al. teach the coating composition comprises, for example, an aqueous (high boiling) and organic (low boiling) solvent (col. 13, lines 48-52). Muir et al. further teach various other solvents for the coating composition (col. 8, line 59 – col. 9, line 55) including ethanol (col. 18, lines 54-60). Muir et al. exemplify ethyl acetate, an obvious variant of the closely related ester, ethyl lactate. Muir et al. further exemplify the solvents at a ratio of about 1:1 (col. 18, lines 54-60).

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 31, 32, 34-37, 52-54, and 76-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanderlaan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,087,415; issued July 11, 2000).

Regarding claims 1-3 and 6 Vanderlaan et al. teach a method for manufacturing a contact lens comprising the steps: a) coating a molding surface of a mold with a coating of a high molecular weight coating composition (col. 1, lines 36-40; col. 2, lines 32-38); b) dispensing the monomer mixture comprising a silicone containing hydrogel monomer into the mold (col. 2, lines 38-47); and c) curing the monomer mixture and the coating composition (col. 6, lines 1-10). Further, Vanderlaan et al. teach an overlapping dwell time where the contact time is preferably from about 1 minute to 60 minutes (col. 5, lines 12-22).



It is noted that the coating employed by Vanderlaan et al. moves to the surface of the to be molded article when mixed with the hydrogel monomer. As such, the high molecular weight coating composition intrinsically coats the molding surface such that the instant claims are patentably indistinguishable from the teaching of Vanderlaan et al.

As to claims 5 and 7, Vanderlaan et al. teach the molecular weight is greater than about 300 kD (col. 2, lines 32-38).

Regarding claims 31, 32, and 37 Vanderlaan et al. teach a method for manufacturing a contact lens comprising the steps: a) coating a molding surface of a mold with a coating of a high molecular weight coating composition of greater than 300 kD (col. 1, lines 36-40; col. 2, lines 32-38); b) dispensing the monomer mixture comprising a silicone containing hydrogel monomer into the mold (col. 2, lines 38-47); and c) curing the monomer mixture and the coating composition (col. 6, lines 1-10). Further, Vanderlaan et al. teach an overlapping dwell time where the contact time is preferably from about 1 minute to 60 minutes (col. 5, lines 12-22).

It is noted that the coating employed by Vanderlaan et al. moves to the surface of the to be molded the article when mixed with the hydrogel monomer. As such, the high molecular weight coating composition intrinsically coats the molding surface such that the instant claims are patentably indistinguishable from the teaching of Vanderlaan et al.

It is noted that the recitation of about 1 minute and about 45 seconds provide an overlapping range.

As to claims 34 and 35, Vanderlaan et al. teach various silicone hydrogel monomer mixtures may be employed (col. 2, lines 38-47).

As to claim 36, Vanderlaan et al. teach the coating composition can be various carboxyl functional polymers (col. 2, lines 22-32).

As to claims 52-54 and 76-78 Vanderlaan et al. teach the method of claims 1 and 31 as discussed in the 103(a) rejections above, but do not specify the viscosity of the coating compositions. However, Vanderlaan et al. teach adding a solvent to the mixture and teach employing the same materials. As such, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill to control the amount of solvent within the claimed viscosity ranges to ensure the coating was readily able to coat the mold.

### ***Conclusion***

All claims are rejected.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent 6,818,018 is one example that demonstrates the interchangeability of ethyl lactate and ethyl acetate as a solvent.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeff Wollschlager whose telephone number is 571-272-8937. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:00 - 4:45, alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson can be reached on 571-272-1176. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1732


number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JW

Jeff Wollschlager  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1732

June 1, 2006

  
CHRISTINA JOHNSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
6/5/06